

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-15 and 17-20 are independent claims. No claims are amended.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over WO 99/01984 to Maissel, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Maissel”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,559,549 to Hendricks, et al. (hereinafter, merely “Hendricks”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,614,940 to Cobbley et al. (hereinafter, merely “Cobbley”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“A transmitting apparatus for providing digital content, comprising:

...meta information schema storing means for storing a meta information schema that defines the data structure of meta information about the content data according to the content data that is transmitted,

wherein the meta information schema is periodically updated to effectively add, delete, and transmit the meta information and to improve a searching efficiency of the meta information...

...wherein user history information of meta information is periodically received from the receiving apparatus,

wherein attributes, whose applied frequencies are low as indicated by the use history information are deleted from said meta information schema.” (Emphasis added)

The Office Action (pages 4-5) relies on Maissel to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. As understood by Applicants, Maissel relates to an intelligent agent for customizing the program schedule information based, at least in part, on the viewer preference profile to produce a program guide.

First, Applicants submit that Maissel fails to disclose or suggest “meta information schema storing means for storing a meta information schema that defines the data structure of meta information about the content data according to the content data that is transmitted”, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The Office Action (see page 4) relies on page 20, lines 19-31, and page 21, lines 1-5, and pages 30, lines 20-27 of Maissel to disclose the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action reads “the EPG data before customization at a user site” as a meta information schema. Applicants submit that the EPG data contains program schedule information but not attributes of the program schedule information. Therefore, Applicants submit that Maissel’s EPG is not a meta information schema.

Second, Applicants submit that Maissel fails to disclose or suggest “wherein the meta information schema is periodically updated to effectively add, delete, and transmit the meta information and to improve a searching efficiency of the meta information”, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action (page 4) relies on page 16, line 17-page 17, line 16 of Maissel to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action reads “changes of program guide information over time to represent programming for the next time period” as updating meta information schema. Applicants submit that changes of program guide information may

suggest changing meta information of programs but does not suggest or teach updating the meta information schema.

Third, Applicants submit that Maissel fails to disclose or suggest “wherein use history information of meta information is periodically received from the receiving apparatus”, as recited in claim 1. The Office Action (see page 5) relies on page 18, lines 18-30 of Maissel to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action reads “viewing history” as the use history information that is periodically received from the receiving apparatus. Applicants submit that Maissel’s viewing history is stored in the interface unit (110) in contrast with Applicants’ use history information that is periodically received from the receiving apparatus.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that Maissel fails to disclose or suggest “wherein attributes, whose applied frequencies are low as indicated by the use history information, are deleted from said meta information schema”, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). The Office Action (page 5) relies on page 21, lines 1-5 of Maissel to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action reads “programming not viewed and preferred by the user” as Applicants’ claimed attributes. Applicants submit that specific programs in the EPG and attributes in the meta information schema are different matters. Applicants submit that specific programs serve as values of attributes but not attributes in the meta information schema.

Applicants submit that Maissel, Hendricks, and Cobbley, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the above identified features in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10-15 and 17-20 are similar in scope and are patentable for similar reasons.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800